

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

RECEIVED
Aug 19 2008
AUG 19 2008
MICHAEL W. DOBBINS
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

BERNARD MIDDLETON

(Enter above the full name
of the plaintiff or plaintiffs in
this action)

vs.

Case No: _____
(To be supplied by the Clerk of this Court)

PEOPLE OF THE STATE :

ANDREW M. VARGA

LEANNA L. RAJIK

EDWARD FARLEY (DET.)

(Enter above the full name of ALL
defendants in this action. Do not
use "et al.")

CHECK ONE ONLY:

☒

COMPLAINT UNDER THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, TITLE 42 SECTION 1983
U.S. Code (state, county, or municipal defendants)

COMPLAINT UNDER THE CONSTITUTION ("BIVENS" ACTION), TITLE
28 SECTION 1331 U.S. Code (federal defendants)

OTHER (cite statute, if known)

**BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS COMPLAINT, PLEASE REFER TO "INSTRUCTIONS FOR
FILING." FOLLOW THESE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY.**

I. Plaintiff(s):

- A. Name: BERNARD MIDDLETON
- B. List all aliases: N/A
- C. Prisoner identification number: R 09866
- D. Place of present confinement: MENARD CORRECTIONS
- E. Address: P.O. BOX 711, MENARD IL 62259

(If there is more than one plaintiff, then each plaintiff must list his or her name, aliases, I.D. number, place of confinement, and current address according to the above format on a separate sheet of paper.)

II. Defendant(s):

(In A below, place the full name of the first defendant in the first blank, his or her official position in the second blank, and his or her place of employment in the third blank. Space for two additional defendants is provided in B and C.)

- A. Defendant: ANDREW M. VARGA #07 C1 3755
 Title: PROSECUTOR
 Place of Employment: 2650 S. CALIFORNIA (COOK)
- B. Defendant: LEANNA L. RAJIK #07 C1 3756
 Title: PROSECUTOR
 Place of Employment: 2650 S.
- C. Defendant: EDWARD FARLEY # 20643
 Title: TASK FORCE DETECTIVE
 Place of Employment: 5100 S. WENTWORTH

(If you have more than three defendants, then all additional defendants must be listed according to the above format on a separate sheet of paper.)

III. List ALL lawsuits you (and your co-plaintiffs, if any) have filed in any state or federal court in the United States:

- A. Name of case and docket number: 04C 0037
- B. Approximate date of filing lawsuit: 1-2-04
- C. List all plaintiffs (if you had co-plaintiffs), including any aliases: N/A
- D. List all defendants: PEOPLE OF THE STATE
- E. Court in which the lawsuit was filed (if federal court, name the district; if state court, name the county): NORTHERN ILLINOIS DIST.
- F. Name of judge to whom case was assigned: HONO. ZABEL
- G. Basic claim made: DNA EXPUNGMENT AND
\$ 30,000.000
- H. Disposition of this case (for example: Was the case dismissed? Was it appealed? Is it still pending?): DISMISSED
FAILING TO STATE WHAT RELIEF EXPECTED
- I. Approximate date of disposition: FEB. OR MARCH 2004.

IF YOU HAVE FILED MORE THAN ONE LAWSUIT, THEN YOU MUST DESCRIBE THE ADDITIONAL LAWSUITS ON ANOTHER PIECE OF PAPER, USING THIS SAME FORMAT. REGARDLESS OF HOW MANY CASES YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY FILED, YOU WILL NOT BE EXCUSED FROM FILLING OUT THIS SECTION COMPLETELY, AND FAILURE TO DO SO MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF YOUR CASE. CO-PLAINTIFFS MUST ALSO LIST ALL CASES THEY HAVE FILED.

IV. Statement of Claim:

State here as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Describe how each defendant is involved, including names, dates, and places. Do not give any legal arguments or cite any cases or statutes. If you intend to allege a number of related claims, number and set forth each claim in a separate paragraph. (Use as much space as you need. Attach extra sheets if necessary.)

THIS ENTIRE CASE STEMS FROM THE RESULTS OF FORCE BLOOD EXTRACTION THAT HAPPEN AT WESTERN ILLINOIS CORRECTIONAL CENTER NOV 25, 2002.

ON PAROLE APRIL 15, 2003, MR MIDDLETON WAS ARRESTED AND ACCUSED OF RETAIL THEFT.... 18 DAYS LATER 5-3-03, MR MIDDLETON WAS REARRESTED AND CHARGED WITH 1ST DEGREE MURDER AND 3, AGG. CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT FROM THE FINDINGS OF THAT FORCED BLOOD EXTRACTION.

DETECTIVE FARLEY FROM THE TASK FORCE, RAN TO THE MEDIA, BUT SOMEHOW HE FORGOT TO TELL THE REPORTERS THAT THESE CHARGES CLASS X WERE SELF-INCRIMINATING.

RETAIL THEFT-03 CR 09384 - DISMISSED ✓

MURDER - 03 CR 11167 - NOT GUILTY ✓

AGG. C.S.A - 03 CR 11168 - NOLLE PROCESS ✓

AGG. C.S.A - 03 CR 11169 - PENDING

AGG. C.S.A - 03 CR 11170 - NOLLE PROCESS ✓

ON APRIL 15, 2003, THE STATE WANTED PROSECUTION ON 03 CR 09384, (THEFT). THE PROSECUTOR DISMISSED THE CASE ON 10-27-07. THE DEFENDANT IS COMPLAINING BECAUSE HE LOST HIS CHANCE

TO LOOK HIS ACCUSER IN THE EYE AND CALL HIM A LIE. THE DEFENDANT WAS DISTROYED BY THE MEDIA FOR AN ENTIRE WEEK. MY FAMILY AND FRIENDS DONT EVEN SPEAK TO ME (PER DETECTIVE FARLEY) ADDING INSULTS TO INJURY'S, THE DEFENDANT WAS THROWN IN DETENTION FOR YEARS WITHOUT AN INDICTMENT, NOR A PRELIMINARY JURY CONFERENCE ON ALL (4 CLASS X CHARGES) INCLUDING THEFT.

DIRTY TACTIC ON THE 11167 CASE.

THE PROSECUTORS WANTED PROSECUTION ON THEIR SELF-INCRIMINATING CHARGE (MURDER-RAPE). IT TOOK 7. MONTHS TO FILE 3. MOTION (PRO'SE) TO THE COURT. . . . MOTION TO QUASH ARREST, AND MOTION TO DISMISS INDICTMENT, AND MOTION TO DISMISS ATTORNEY. . . . THE COURT WOULD SAY THAT THEY NEVER RECEIVE THE MOTION, AND THEY WERE NEVER RETURNED TO THE SENDER

ONEDAY THE JUDGE REPORTED SICK AND HE COULD

(11167 CASE CONTINUES)

NOT RETURN TO THE BENCH. HIS REPLACEMENT JUDGE GAINER CHANGED THE COURSE OF THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS, AND MY MOTIONS WAS FILED FEB 22, 2007, ON THAT DAY I COMPLAINED ON RECORD ABOUT THE COURTS BEHAVIOR. THE COURT WERE ALLOWING THE PROSECUTORS TO FRAME ME OF MURDER-RAPE, AFTER TRYING BUT WERE DENIED USING THE MURDER-RAPE AS PROOF OF OTHER CRIMES.

THEY KNEW THE DNA NEVER LINK ME TO THE MURDER-RAPE, THEY WERE TOLD BY MR. BRENDAN MAX A (DNA EXPERT) "THAT THEY DIDNT HAVE A CATCH," USING MEDICAL TERMS ON OCT. 2 2006.

AFTER THAT DAY MR. BRENDAN MAX WAS NEVER SEEN AGAIN TO THIS DAY. THE COURT WERE ALLOWING THAT UNCONSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR. I AM ~~ALLOW~~ AVAILABLE FOR TESTING TO SHINE LIGHT ON THEIR PARTIALITY, PREJUDICE AND INJUSTICE, BECAUSE THEY HAD NO INTENTIONS ON FOLLOWING THE PROPER PROCEDURES.

DETECTIVE FARLEY #20643, IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MEDIA'S SLANDER.

11168 CASE

THE 11168, CASE HAS BEEN NOLLE PROCESS, WHY? THE CHARGE IS FROM THE RESULTS OF FORCED BLOOD EXTRACTION, AND THE PROSECUTORS DID NOT GIVE THEIR DEFENDANT AN INDICTMENT NOR A PRELIMINARY JURY CONFERENCE.

I'AM ASKING BECAUSE THE PROSECUTORS REPEATED THEIR BEHAVIOR ON ALL 5, CHARGES. FURTHERMORE THE EVIDENCE WERE SELF-INCRIMINATING. CAN THEY DO THAT?

HOWEVER, MY ONLY REGRET IS BEING ROBBED AGAIN OF AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVE TO THE PROSECUTORS THAT DORIS WAS MY EX PROSTITUTE FOR MANY YEARS, AND TO SHOW THEM THAT THIS CASE IS FROM THE RESULTS OF A WOMANS SCORN.

SHE KILLED HERSELF FROM A DRUG OVER DOSE. DETECTIVE FARLEY #20643, IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MEDIA'S BRUTAL AND SLANDER.

DIRTY TACTIC ON 11170 CASE

BETWEEN THE MEDIA AND THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN MY COMPLAINT, I'AM SURE THEIR UNCONSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR HAS BEEN HIGHLIGHTED.... THE PREJUDICE, THE PARTIALITY, AND THE INIUSTICE IN THIS CASE 11170, IS UNBELIEVEABLE.

ON JULY 27, 2007, RIGHT AFTER THE NOT GUILTY VERDICT ON THE MURDER, CASE(11167), THE PROSECUTOR ANNOUNCED WITH RAGE THAT HE WILL BE READY FOR TRIAL IN 30, DAYS FOR AGG. CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT. 11170, WERE REGISTERED AS PREDATORY FOR $4\frac{1}{2}$, YEARS IN MY DISCOVERY, AND NOW ITS SUDDENLY CHANGED OVER NIGHT? MY PUBLIC DEFENDER SAID YES, AND WE WILL BE TAKING A JURY.

(THEY LOST THEIR MINDS).

ON AUG 22, 2007, I WROTE THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION AND REPORTED THEIR ACTION. THEY SAID THE JUDGE IN THE CASE CAN RESOLVE IT... MY UNDERSTANDING, IF THE JUDGE CAN RESOLVE THAT PROBLEM, HE WERE SHOWING PARTIALITY.

LETS NO FORGET DETECTIVE FARLEY # 20643, WHO RAN TO THE MEDIA WITH SLANDER.

OPINION

FROM THE START THEY HAD NO INTENTIONS IN FOLLOWING THE PROPER PROCEDURES. THE ILLINOIS SUPREME CRT. HAD ESTABLISHED THESE RULES CLEARLY LONG-AGO,

SO THEY LITERALLY KIDNAPPED ME, AND IGNORED THOSE ESTABLISHED RULES THAT WAS MADE BEFORE THEY WERE BORN.

ARE THE PROSECUTORS DEMONSTRATING THAT THE CONSTITUTION SHOULD NOT APPLIES TO POOR AFRICAN AMERICANS BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT MR. BERNARD MIDDLETON IS STILL BEING HELD IN DETENTION ON ACTS THAT HAS BEEN RULED VOID.

WITH ALL DUE RESPECT.

MR. MIDDLETON

V. Relief:

State briefly exactly what you want the court to do for you. Make no legal arguments. Cite no cases or statutes.

MR MIDDLETON IS SEEKING RELIEF FOR HIS 4TH, 5TH, 8TH, 14TH, AMENDMENT VIOLATION, SLANDER, MENTAL ANGUISH, STRESS, PUNITIVE, MONITARY, IN THE SUM OF 30. MILLION DOLLARS IN DAMAGES. 03 CR 11167, 03 CR 11168, 03 CR 11170, 03 CR 09384.

VI. The plaintiff demands that the case be tried by a jury. ☐ YES ☒ NO

CERTIFICATION

By signing this Complaint, I certify that the facts stated in this Complaint are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that if this certification is not correct, I may be subject to sanctions by the Court.

Signed this 18TH day of AUG, 20 08

Bernard Middleton

(Signature of plaintiff or plaintiffs)

BERNARD MIDDLETON

(Print name)

PRISON R09866 / JAIL 200327415

(I.D. Number)

MENARD CORRECTIONS

711 KASKASKIA DRIVE

MENARD IL, 62259-0711

(Address)